Subject: V4.0 Exclusive Button Groups Posted by cavanaug on Fri, 26 May 1995 07:00:00 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Here is one in what I assume will be many "How come IDL V4.0 handles [insert programming concept here] differently than V3.6?" questions.

With V3.6, it was possible that an exclusive button group could have none of the buttons set. With V4.0, this seems to be impossible, as clicking on the button that was previously set does not generate an event. I have lots of code where it is important that only one (or none) of a list of conditions is set. I would like to retain the "none" aspect of the conditions list, but it seems now I'll have to revisit all this code.

Has anyone else experienced this behavior, and if so, is there a simple solution to return behavior to that of V3.6 (without returning to V3.6)?

Thanks,

Charles

-Charles Cavanaugh | "Words are very unnecessary, they can only do harm" cavanaug@ncar.ucar.edu | - Depeche Mode

NCAR Boulder, CO, USA | "Facts all come with points of view"

My opinions | - Talking Heads

Subject: Re: V4.0 Exclusive Button Groups
Posted by thompson on Tue, 30 May 1995 07:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

zawodny@arbd0.larc.nasa.gov (Joseph M Zawodny) writes:

> In article <3q4rb7\$sgn@ncar.ucar.edu> cavanaug@uars1.acd.ucar.edu (Charles Cavanaugh) writes:

>>

- >> Here is one in what I assume will be many "How come IDL V4.0 handles
- >> [insert programming concept here] differently than V3.6?" questions.

>>

- >> With V3.6, it was possible that an exclusive button group could have
- >> none of the buttons set. With V4.0, this seems to be impossible, as
- >> clicking on the button that was previously set does not generate an
- >> event. I have lots of code where it is important that only one (or
- >> none) of a list of conditions is set. I would like to retain the
- >> "none" aspect of the conditions list, but it seems now I'll have to

>> revisit all this code.

>>

- >> Has anyone else experienced this behavior, and if so, is there a simple
- >> solution to return behavior to that of V3.6 (without returning to V3.6)?
- > Hooray! I have been waiting for this feature to come about for some time.
- > I think the solution to your problem is to add a button (call it NONE) to
- > you exclusive button widget. You could test for the IDL version and add
- > it only if your at or beyond (assuming RSI will not un-fix it in a future
- > release) V4.0.

This new behavior may be good for you, but it obviously adversely affects other people. The concept of backwards compatibility is an extremely important one that RSI should pay more attention to. In this case, RSI should have allowed for the additional functionality that you wanted with a keyword, rather than changing the default behavior.

William Thompson

Subject: Re: V4.0 Exclusive Button Groups Posted by zawodny on Tue, 30 May 1995 07:00:00 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In article <3q4rb7\$sgn@ncar.ucar.edu> cavanaug@uars1.acd.ucar.edu (Charles Cavanaugh) writes:

>

- > Here is one in what I assume will be many "How come IDL V4.0 handles
- > [insert programming concept here] differently than V3.6?" questions.

>

- > With V3.6, it was possible that an exclusive button group could have
- > none of the buttons set. With V4.0, this seems to be impossible, as
- > clicking on the button that was previously set does not generate an
- > event. I have lots of code where it is important that only one (or
- > none) of a list of conditions is set. I would like to retain the
- > "none" aspect of the conditions list, but it seems now I'll have to
- > revisit all this code.

>

- > Has anyone else experienced this behavior, and if so, is there a simple
- > solution to return behavior to that of V3.6 (without returning to V3.6)?

Hooray! I have been waiting for this feature to come about for some time. I think the solution to your problem is to add a button (call it NONE) to you exclusive button widget. You could test for the IDL version and add it only if your at or beyond (assuming RSI will not un-fix it in a future release) V4.0.

--

Joseph M. Zawodny (KO4LW) NASA Langley Research Center Internet: j.m.zawodny@larc.nasa.gov MS-475, Hampton VA, 2 TCP/IP: ko4lw@ko4lw.ampr.org Packet: ko4lw@n4hog.va.usa.na MS-475, Hampton VA, 23681-0001